

The South has been shortchanged time and again. We are going to join a coalition to make sure our farmers get their fair share and that we are providing the taxpayers a good return on the money that is invested. We need to create ways to help farmers minimize the cost to the taxpayers and maximize the total benefit.

#### ELECTION REFORM

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I will take 2 more minutes, if I can, to say a word about the election reform measure that Senator DODD spoke about just a few minutes ago.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of that election reform measure. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for leading this effort, for being such a terrific and articulate spokesperson for improving our election system in this Nation.

It truly is a travesty and really a hypocrisy for us to encourage people to register to vote, urge them to exercise their full rights as citizens, and then not count their votes, or turn them away at the polls.

In the year 2001, that should not be the case. That should not be the case at any time. Unfortunately, there have been dark places in our history where people by the millions were turned away or were not allowed to register. Our country has made great progress.

As the last election showed, and as we need to discuss when we come back, we have a lot of fixing to do. There are improvements that need to be made. We need to proudly stand up to the world and say: Yes, we want our citizens registered, and if they are a legal voter, whether they are in a wheelchair, visually impaired, or have other physical challenges, despite the fact they may be older or not as strong and as able, they have a right to vote and they have a right to have their vote counted, and they have a right to the kind of equipment and technology that is available that makes sure those votes are counted and certified.

In conclusion, no system is going to be perfect, but the evidence is in to suggest that the system we have in the United States can and should be perfected. I am proud that in Louisiana we do have standardized voting machines, and we have worked very hard on opening access to those polling places.

Even in Louisiana, where we do have standardized voting machines, and state-of-the-art technology in poor and wealthy districts, rural and urban districts, we can make improvements there.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important subject when we return.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARNAHAN). Will the Senator withhold her request for a quorum call?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

#### ENERGY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I will try to be brief because I am sure there are many who would like to start the recess.

Madam President, I call your attention and that of my colleagues to the activity in the U.S. House of Representatives which occurred the day before yesterday, rather late at night. This involved the reporting out of an energy bill, a very comprehensive bill. As a consequence, the baton now passes to the Senate. There is going to be a great deal of debate in the committee, on which I am the ranking member, along with other members of that committee, including the Senator from Louisiana who just addressed this body. As a consequence of that debate and the development of our own energy bill at this time, I will highlight one of the topical points in that bill that affects my State of Alaska. That is the issue of ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

The action by the House is very responsible. It puts the issue in perspective. The issue has been that somehow this huge area called ANWR, an area of 19 million acres, an area that is approximately the size of the State of South Carolina, is at risk by any action by the Congress to initiate authorization for exploration.

What the House has done is extraordinary, mandating a limitation of 2,000 acres to be the footprint associated with any development that might occur in that area. It takes the whole issue and puts it in perspective that, indeed, This is not more than four or five small farms, assuming the rest of the area of the State of South Carolina were a wilderness. That is the perspective.

For those who argue ANWR is at risk, the House action has clearly identified the footprint will be 2,000 acres. What will that do to America's technology, to America's ingenuity? It will challenge it. It will say, we must develop this field, if indeed the oil is there, with this kind of footprint.

This technology has been developed in this country. The exploration phase is three-dimensional. It suggests that you can drill under the U.S. Capitol and come out at gate 8 at Reagan Airport. That is the technology. This gives side views of what lies under the ground and the prospects for oil and gas. It mandates the best technology. It mandates we must develop this technology, and as a consequence puts a challenge to the environmental community, the engineering community, and our Nation. That challenge will help make this the best oilfield in the world, bar none.

What else does it have? It has a project labor agreement. That means

there will be a contractual commitment between the unions, the Teamsters, and the AFL-CIO, and it will create thousands of jobs in this country. These are American jobs.

I urge Members to consider for a moment that over half of our deficit balance of payments is the cost of imported oil. Once the Congress speaks on this issue, there will be a reaction from OPEC. That reaction will be very interesting. OPEC is going to increase its supply and the price of oil is going to be reduced in this country. There is no question about it. If OPEC knows we mean business about reducing our dependence on imported oil, they will clearly get the signal.

Furthermore, it is rather interesting what the House did with the disposition of royalties. The anticipated revenue from lease sales for the Federal land in this area is somewhere in the area of \$1.5 to \$2 billion. That money is not just beginning to go in the Federal Treasury; it will go into the development of alternative and renewable sources of energy. So we have the funds to develop the new technologies.

One of the misconceptions in this country that covers energy is that it is all the same. It isn't. We generate electricity from coal. The State of West Virginia is a major supplier of coal. Nearly 51 percent of the energy produced in this country comes from coal. We also have the capability to produce from nuclear. About 22 percent of our energy comes from nuclear. We also use a large amount of natural gas, but our natural gas reserves are going down faster than we are finding new ones.

We have hydro; we have wind; we have solar. These are all important in the mix. The funds from the sale or lease in ANWR are going to go back and develop renewable sources of energy.

The point I make is why these energies are important. America moves on oil. The world moves on oil. There is no alternative. We must find an alternative, perhaps fuel sales, perhaps hydrogen technology, but it is not there. We will be increasingly dependent on sources from overseas.

I know the President pro tempore remembers the issue of the U2 over Russia, Gary Powers, an American pilot in an observation plane that was shot down. At that time, we were contemplating a major meeting of the world leaders to try and relieve tensions. When his plane was shot down, tensions were increased dramatically between the Soviet Union and the United States. It was a time of great tension.

The other day we had a U2 flying over Iraq with an American pilot. We were enforcing a no-fly zone. We were doing an observation. A missile was shot at that aircraft, barely missing it. It blew up behind the tail. It hardly made page 5 in the news.

We are importing a million barrels a day from Iraq. We are enforcing a no-fly zone over Iraq. We have flown 231,000 individual sorties, with men and women flying our aircraft, enforcing this no-fly zone, ensuring his targets are not fully developed. Occasionally we bomb and take out targets.

How ironic; here we are, importing a million barrels a day, enforcing a no-fly zone, taking on his targets, but we are taking this oil and putting it in our aircraft to do it. I don't know about our foreign policy.

What does he do with the money he receives from us? His Republican Guards keep Saddam Hussein alive. He develops a missile delivery capability. He puts on a biological warhead, perhaps. Where is it aimed? At our ally, Israel. Virtually every speech Saddam Hussein gives is concluded with "death to Israel."

Where does this fit in the big picture? Six weeks ago we imported 750,000 barrels a day from Iraq. I find it frustrating. We had another little experience about 3½ weeks ago. Saddam Hussein was not satisfied with the sanctions being levied by the U.N. He said: I will cut my oil production 2.5 million for 30 days. That is 60 million barrels. We all thought OPEC would stand up and increase production. They didn't. They have a cartel. We can't have cartels in this country. We have antitrust laws against them.

My point is quite evident. OPEC, the Mideast nations, are trying to stick together, hold up the price, because they are increasing their leverage on the United States. What does that do to the national security of this country? It is quite obvious to me.

There is another argument that was used. We heard it on the House floor: Ban the export of any Alaskan oil that might come from ANWR. Fine, I will support that.

One of the amusing observations I made the other day is that one of the Members of the House got up and said we have to oppose opening this because all the oil is going to Japan. That is nonsense. So it is prohibited in the authorization. The last oil that was exported outside the United States from Alaska occurred a year ago last April, a very small amount that was surplus. But it is not surplus anymore because California is now importing a great deal of foreign oil because they have increased their utilization while Alaska has declined in its production.

If you go through the arguments that will be before this body on the ANWR issue, please think about the action of the House, the responsible action of the House. No longer is 19 million acres at risk, an area the size of the State of South Carolina; 2,000 acres is at risk. Is that a reasonable compromise to address our energy security? Certainly. It mandates the best use and the highest use of particular knowledge. It has a

project labor agreement in it. The unions think very highly of this because it has become a jobs issue.

We have an obligation to do what is right for America. We know our environmental friends have taken a stand on this, but most of their arguments are gone. Can you open it safely? Surely; and the Federal royalties are going to go back for conservation and renewables and R&D. We are going to put a ban on exports, resolving that issue.

ANWR has been the focal point of a lot of misinformation by environmental extremists. They have tried to hold it hostage for their own publicity, membership, and dollars, and they have been quite effective. But the House vote proves that when we really look beyond the rhetoric, we can safely explore the resources in ANWR.

I applaud the House leadership for crafting a compromise, a balanced bill, one that I think every Member should seriously consider.

After the recess, I am going to be discussing this issue at some length. I hope my colleagues will join me. We have heard from a few who say, we are going to filibuster this. You are going to filibuster an energy bill? Is that what you really want to do? Are you going to filibuster and in effect cause us to increase our dependence on imported oil? Filibuster a bill that will provide more American jobs for American labor? I welcome that debate.

It is amusing, and I am going to conclude on this note because I see the President pro tempore patiently waiting, how things change in our media as they are exposed to the pressures from special interest groups. I am going to quote from the Chattanooga Free Press, June 3 of this year, an article done by Reed Irvine. He cites the issue of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, the issue of arsenic in the drinking water, the idea of trying to bring things into balance. He specifically takes on two of the major newspapers in this country, the Washington Post and the New York Times, by reminding us of their gross inconsistency. He states:

In 1987, a Washington Post editorial describing ANWR as one of the "bleakest, most remote places on the continent" said, "(T)here is hardly any other place where drilling would have less impact on surrounding life . . . Congress would be right to go ahead and, with all the conditions and environmental precautions that apply in Prudhoe Bay, see what's under the refuge's tundra."

In 1988, a New York Times editorial said of the area, "(T)he potential is enormous and the environmental risks are modest . . . the likely value of the oil far exceeds plausible estimates of the environmental cost." It concluded, "(I)t is hard to see why absolutely pristine preservation of this remote wilderness should take precedence over the nation's energy needs."

That was in 1988. We are importing right now close to 60 percent of the oil we consume. The article goes on to say:

Since then our energy needs have become more pressing, but with new editorial page editors, both these papers are now singing a different tune about the ANWR. At the Times, editorial-page editor Howell Raines has dumbed-down the paper's editorial pages and op-ed pages. A good example is an editorial on drilling for oil in ANWR published last March. It said, "This page has addressed the folly of trespassing on a wondrous, wild-life preserve for what, by official estimates, is likely to be a modest amount of economically recoverable oil."

What the Post had described as "one of the bleakest, most remote places on the continent" had somehow in the flick of a new editorial editor been transformed, in 14 years, to some wonderful wildlife preserve.

Having worked that miracle, Raines has been designated as the next executive editor of the paper.

Over on the other side:

Fred Hiatt, who succeeded Meg Greenfield as the editorial page editor of the Washington Post, effected a similar transformation. Now a Post editorial describes that formerly remote, bleak wasteland as, "a unique ecological resource" and says that exploiting it "for more oil to feed more of the same old profligate habits would be to take the wrong first step." The Post accused [those of us in this body who support this] of "demagoguery."

How clever.

I ask unanimous consent the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga Times/Chattanooga Free Press, June 3, 2001]

SHADY ENVIRONMENTALISM  
(By Reed Irvine)

Environmentalists come in many shades of green, but a lot of them are just plain shady, ignoring science and common sense and jumping on the green bandwagon for partisan political purposes. This is evident in the rush of people to bash the Bush environmental initiatives. All of a sudden, thanks to a last minute move by Bill Clinton, countless Americans began quaking in their boots, having learned from the media that something very few of them had ever heard of before, arsenic in drinking water, might give them cancer.

They were not told that this conclusion was based on studies in countries where the level of arsenic in drinking water is as much as 10 times higher than the 50 parts per billion maximum level permitted in the U.S. We have yet to see a study showing that cancers caused by arsenic are more prevalent in communities in this country where arsenic in drinking water is above average than in those communities where it is below average. We have seen a story in the New York Times reporting that arsenic is used at the Sloan Kettering Institute to cure a particularly vicious type of leukemia.

Even more than arsenic in drinking water, the proposed drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge has been used to bash President Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney. Back in the 1980s, two of our most influential newspapers, the Washington Post and the New York Times, favored exploitation of the oil in this remote, inhospitable region of Alaska.

In 1987, a Washington Post editorial describing this area as "one of the bleakest,



most remote places on this continent" said, "(T)here is hardly any other place where drilling would have less impact on the surrounding life . . . Congress would be right to go ahead and, with all the conditions and environmental precautions that apply to Prudhoe Bay, see what's under the refuge's tundra."

In 1988, a New York times editorial said of this area, "(T)he potential is enormous and the environmental risks are modest . . . the likely value of the oil far exceeds plausible estimates of the environmental cost." It concluded "(I)t is hard to see why absolutely pristine preservation of this remote wilderness should take precedence over the nation's energy needs."

Since then our energy needs have become more pressing, but with new editorial-page editors, both of these papers are now singing a different tune about the ANWR. At the Times, editorial-page editor Howell Raines, has dumbed-down the paper's editorial and op-ed pages. A good example is an editorial on drilling for oil in the ANWR published last March. It said, "This page has addressed the folly of trespassing on a wondrous wildlife preserve for what, by official estimates, is likely to be a modest amount of economically recoverable oil." What the Post had described as "one of the bleakest, most remote places on this continent," had been transformed in 14 years to "a wondrous wildlife preserve." Having worked that miracle, Raines has been designated as the next executive editor of the paper.

Fred Hiatt, who succeeded Meg Greenfield as editorial-page editor of the Washington Post, effected a similar transformation. Now a Post editorial describes that formerly remote, bleak wasteland as "a unique ecological resource" and says that exploiting it "for more oil to feed more of the same old profligate habits would be to take the wrong step first." The Post accused the Alaska senators who advocate drilling for oil in the ANWR of "demagoguery."

Sen. Frank Murkowski sent a letter to the Post in which he pointed out that Alaska has 125 million acres of national parks, preserves and wildlife refuges, of which 19 million acres are in the ANWR. Congress set aside 1.5 million ANWR acres for possible oil and gas exploration. The Bush proposal is to permit drilling on about 2,000 acres, about one-hundredth of 1 percent of the entire refuge. Sen. Murkowski concluded, "I suggest the demagoguery comes when you follow the extreme environmentalist line: 19 million acres for wildlife and pristine conditions and not even 2,000 acres for energy security." Energy security is not a minor consideration. The U.S. imported 37 percent of its oil in the 1970s and 57 percent today. It is said that ANWR could supply only enough oil to meet our needs for six months. That might be true if ANWR were our only source of oil. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that there is enough oil there to replace our imports from Saudi Arabia for the next 20 to 30 years. Only a very shady environmentalist would shun that.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. My next effort after the recess will be to come back and discuss the energy situation. It is not a matter of pointing fingers. When we come back, I will say why we are focusing in on oil exploration as well. I am going to try to answer the question why is it safer and better to import our oil rather than drilling right here in America by providing the facts. We need to know what we have in America first.

I am going to talk about how the experts estimate ANWR might only contain a 6-month supply of oil, which is absolutely ridiculous because that would be true only if we produced no oil nor imported any into the United States for 6 months. ANWR has the potential of equaling what we are currently importing from Saudi Arabia for a 30-year period of time.

We are going to answer the question of whether we should focus more on conservation. I am going to answer that by saying we need a balance.

I am going to answer the question of why it takes energy so long to turn it around once the shortage begins to become noticed.

I am going to talk about why we must act now because we are going to be held responsible if, indeed, we do not act now.

Madam President, I thank the President pro tempore for his attention. I remind my colleague we have some heavy lifting to do because the American people are looking for action.

We started in 1992. I was on the committee. Senator BENNETT JOHNSTON was chairman of that committee. We put out an energy bill from that committee. When it came to this floor, we gave away clean coal; we gave away nuclear; we gave away hydro; we gave away natural gas; we gave away oil; and we concentrated on alternatives and renewables. We expended \$6 billion. That was a worthwhile effort. But we didn't increase supply.

This is a different year. The "perfect storm" has come together. Our natural gas prices have quadrupled. We haven't built a new coal-fired plant in this Nation since 1995. We haven't done anything with nuclear energy in a quarter of a century. We haven't built a new refinery in 25 years. Now we suddenly find that we don't have a distribution system for our electrical generation or our natural gas generation. We are constrained. It is affecting the economy. It is affecting jobs. It is going to get worse. The American people expect us to come back and do something about it. They will not stand for grandstanding. They will not stand for the status quo. They will not stand for the threat of filibusters.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, what is the time limit for Senators to speak?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak using whatever time is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ECONOMIC SLOWDOWN AND BUDGET SURPLUS REVISIONS

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, the Commerce Department reported last

week, July 27, that the U.S. economy grew at an anemic 0.7 percent rate in the second quarter of this year, April 1-June 30. This is the slowest growth rate in 8 years, and considerably lower than the 8.3 percent growth rate seen just 18 months ago.

"If you applied logic to the [economic] news these days," wrote Allan Sloan in the Washington Post on Tuesday, July 31, "the logical conclusion would be that the economy has fallen off a cliff and is about to splatter all over the canyon floor and take us with it."

This week, July 30, the Wall Street Journal reported, "the economy has been pushed to the edge of a recession by a breathtaking decline in business investment." In the second quarter, nonresidential investment tumbled at a 13.6 percent rate. Consumer spending, along with robust state and local government spending, is the only thing that prevented the economy from shrinking over the last three months.

In an effort to stem the tide, the Federal Reserve has dramatically cut short-term interest rates by almost 3 percentage points over the last 7 months. These are the most aggressive rate reductions since the 1982 recession under President Reagan.

Despite this negative economic news, the Administration remains resolutely optimistic about the economy's future, pinning their hopes on the recently enacted tax cut. Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill said last week, July 23, that the U.S. economy might grow by more than 3 percent next year. The President's chief economic advisor, Larry Lindsey, in a speech before the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, reaffirmed this optimistic outlook.

What concerns me is the effect that these tax cuts have had on the economy so far.

Despite the Fed's efforts to cut short-term interest rates to simulate the sluggish economy, long-term interest rates have remained flat or have even risen since earlier this year. The interest rate on the 10-year bond, for example, increased from 4.75 percent in mid-March to just over 5.1 percent today, August 3. Long-term rates have limited efforts by the Fed to stimulate the economy.

What's keeping those rates from falling is the expectation by Wall Street that the recently enacted tax cut has seriously jeopardized our debt retirement efforts. Fed Chairman Greenspan said last week, July 24, before the Senate Banking Committee that long-term rates are higher than expected because of Wall Street's uncertainty about the size of the surpluses and how much debt the federal government will be able to retire.

Just 4 months ago, the President sent his budget to Congress and projected a \$125 billion non-Social Security surplus in the current fiscal year. Today, that